



SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 11-10189

*** CAPITAL CASE ***

Title:

Carlos Trevino, Petitioner

v.

Rick Thaler, Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division

Docketed: May 7, 2012

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

Case Nos.: (10-70004)

Decision Date: November 14, 2011

Rehearing January 31, 2012

Denied:

**Questions
Presented**

~~~Date~~~ ~~~~~Proceedings and Orders~~~~~

Apr 30 2012 Petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due June 6, 2012)

Jun 5 2012 Order extending time to file response to petition to and including August 6, 2012.

Jun 6 2012 Brief amici curiae of Former Federal Judges filed.

Aug 6 2012 Brief of respondent Rick Thaler, Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division in opposition filed.

Aug 16 2012 DISTRIBUTED for Conference of September 24, 2012.

Aug 30 2012 DISTRIBUTED for Conference of September 24, 2012.

Sep 1 2012 Reply of petitioner Carlos Trevino filed. (Distributed)

Oct 11 2012 DISTRIBUTED for Conference of October 26, 2012.

Oct 29 2012 Motion to proceed in forma pauperis and petition for a writ of certiorari GRANTED limited to Question 1 presented by the petition.

~~Name~~~ ~~~~~Address~~~~~ ~~~Phone~~~

**Attorneys for Petitioner:**

Warren Alan Wolf

115 E. Travis Street

(210) 225-  
0055

Suite 746

San Antonio, TX 78205-0000

wwolf711@aol.com

Party name: Carlos Trevino

**Attorneys for Respondent:**

Fredericka Sargent  
Counsel of Record

Assistant Attorney General  
Post Office Box 12548  
Capitol Station  
Austin, TX 78701

(512) 936-  
1400

Party name: Rick Thaler, Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division

**Other:**

Lawrence D. Rosenberg

Jones Day  
51 Louisiana Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
ldrosenberg@jonesday.com

(202) 879-  
3939

Party name: Former Federal Judges

**11-10189 TREVINO V. THALER**

DECISION BELOW: 449 Fed.Appx. 415

LOWER COURT CASE NUMBER: 10-70004

QUESTION PRESENTED:

1. In federal habeas proceedings, undersigned counsel raised for the first time a claim under *Wiggins v. Smith*, 539 U.S. 510 (2003), that trial counsel were ineffective for failing to investigate the extraordinary mitigating evidence in Mr. Trevino's life. The federal proceeding was stayed to allow exhaustion, but the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals dismissed Mr. Trevino's *Wiggins* claim under state abuse of the writ rules. Thereafter, the federal district court dismissed the claim as procedurally barred, finding no cause for the default. On appeal, Mr. Trevino argued that the Court of Appeals should stay further proceedings until this Court resolved the question then-pending in several cases whether ineffective assistance of state habeas counsel in failing to raise a meritorious claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel established cause for the default in state habeas proceedings. The Court of Appeals refused to stay Mr. Trevino's appeal for this purpose. Four months later, this Court decided in *Martinez v. Ryan*, 132 S.Ct. 1309 (March 20, 2012), that ineffective assistance of state habeas counsel in the very circumstance presented by Mr. Trevino's case could establish cause for the default of a claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel. These circumstances present the following question:

Whether the Court should grant certiorari, vacate the Court of Appeals opinion, and remand to the Court of Appeals for consideration of Mr. Trevino's argument under *Martinez v. Ryan*?

2. Mr. Trevino raised a claim under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), that the trial prosecutor suppressed a statement to the police by a codefendant to the effect that Trevino did not commit the capital murder. To rule against this claim, the panel majority in the Court of Appeals-without notice to Mr. Trevino or his counsel-conducted its own investigation of the separate trial court record of this codefendant, found a subsequent statement by him contradicting his exculpatory statement, took judicial notice of the statement and used it as the basis for affirming the district court's denial of Mr. Trevino's *Brady* claim. The panel majority acknowledged the lack of notice to Trevino, but said that he could be heard by petition for rehearing. Trevino presented arguments on rehearing and on rehearing en banc, but both were summarily denied. These circumstances present the following question:

Whether the Court of Appeals' denial of notice and an opportunity to be heard on a matter that is determinative of a meritorious *Brady* issue requires the Court's exercise of its supervisory powers to assure that Mr. Trevino is afforded a fair opportunity to be heard on appeal?

GRANTED LIMITED TO QUESTION 1 PRESENTED BY THE PETITION.  
CERT. GRANTED 10/29/2012